



Corporate Safety Management Systems

David Teater, National Safety Council

Attentive Driving: Countermeasures for Distraction
NTSB Forum, March 27, 2012



Our Mission

The National Safety Council saves lives by preventing injuries and deaths at work, in homes and communities, and on the roads through leadership, research, education and advocacy.

Non-profit Membership Organization

- 20,000 member companies
 - 8 million employees
 - Policy positions based on member input
-
- 2009 nationwide call for ban on all cell phone use while driving
 - The case for all cell phone use including hands free
 - Employers have a history of leadership on traffic safety initiatives
 - Cell phone policies are consistent with other safety policies in an organization



Companies with policies

- Exxon/Mobil
- DuPont
- Halliburton
- Shell
- Chevron
- BP
- Enbridge
- AstraZeneca Pharmaceutical
- CA Office of Traffic Safety
- Abbott Pharmaceutical
- Cargill
- CSX Intermodal
- Schneider National
- Sysco Corporation
- Time Warner Cable
- Potash
- Owens Corning
- NTSB

Just a sample - no national database of companies with policies



Sample cell phone policy

Company employees may not use cellular telephones or mobile electronic devices while operating a motor vehicle under any of the following situations, regardless of whether a hands-free device is used:

- When employee is operating a vehicle owned, leased or rented by the Company.
- When the employee is operating a personal motor vehicle in connection with Company business.
- When the motor vehicle is on Company property.
- When the cellular telephone or mobile electronic device is company owned or leased.
- When the employee is using the cellular telephone or mobile electronic device to conduct Company business.



Productivity is not affected

Survey of NSC member companies – August 2009

- 2,004 respondents - 469 (23.3%) had bans that included both hands-free and handheld wireless communication devices
- Only seven companies (1.5%) with policies reported a decrease in employee productivity
- 46 companies (10%) reported a productivity increase

Survey of Fortune 500 companies – September 2010

- 20% of Fortune 500 companies surveyed have total bans in place – estimated 2 million+ employees
- Among those who responded and had total bans
 - 19 percent said productivity increased
 - 22 percent said productivity remained the same
 - 52 percent don't yet know impact on productivity
 - 7 percent said productivity decreased



Employer liability

\$21.6 million: A stay-at-home dad received the award for the violent wreck that killed his wife, after a jury found a driver negligent for either talking on her cell phone or some other distraction.

\$20.9 million: Dykes Industries of Little Rock, Ark., lost a personal injury suit in which its employee was using a cell phone when the crash occurred.

\$18 million: Holmes Transport, of Muscle Shoals, Ala., was ordered to pay the damages by a U.S. District Judge to Mark Tiburzi who was left unable to walk or talk after a crash caused by one of their drivers distracted by a cell phone.

\$5.2 million: International Paper employee Vanessa McGrogan was using her company-supplied cell phone when she rear-ended a vehicle driven by Debra Ford.

\$2.5 million: State of Hawaii agreed to pay as its share of liability in a crash involving a state employee who was talking on her cell phone when she hit a tourist.

\$1.5 million: City of Palo Alto has agreed to pay the victim of a 2006 vehicle crash involving a city worker who was using his cell phone while driving. The payout is "the largest we've had in a long time on a personal injury claim," said Assistant City Attorney Donald Larkin.



Conclusion

- Employers are leading by example.
- Risk management is a concern but employee health and safety is the primary motivation for total ban policies.
- Productivity is not diminished, may even be enhanced.
- Early reports from employers indicate fewer vehicle crashes.
- Workplace policies have a multiplier effect, spilling over into home and community
- Local, state and federal government employers should lead by example.